

# COBBETT'S WEEKLY POLITICAL REGISTER.

VOL. XVIII. No. 33.] LONDON, SATURDAY, DECEMBER 1, 1810. [Price 1s.

"In the year 1788, when the former suspension of the functions of the Crown took place, we were at peace, now we were at war. France was then weak, now it enjoyed an overwhelming strength. Then our national debt was under 300 millions, now it exceeded 800 millions; at that time we had profitable commercial alliances, now our commerce was excluded from every part of Europe; then we had something besides paper currency, now we had nothing else, and our paper was greatly depreciated. Every thing was then quiet at home, and we had nothing to apprehend from abroad; now how different the picture in every respect. Yet now, that House was told, that after a month of anarchy, they were to go on a fortnight longer in the same tract." — SIR FRANCIS BURDETT.—Debate, 29th Nov. 1810.

1057]

[1058

## SUMMARY OF POLITICS.

**PRISONERS OF WAR.**—This subject is one of very deep interest to the country; and, though I shall not here be able to enter into it so fully as I could wish, I cannot refrain from endeavouring to offer to my readers something bearing a little more the resemblance of political information than what was contained in my last Number, in an extract from the *Courier*. —At page 1044 I inserted the *Project*, or set of *Propositions*, which has been published in the ministerial papers, as having been offered to the Government of France by a Mr. MACKENZIE, who, it appears, has been, for some time past, in France, on the part of our Government, for the purpose of making a Convention for the Exchange of all the Prisoners, possessed on both sides. —These propositions have, it seems, been rejected by the Emperor of France; and, the question for us to discuss, is, *whether the Propositions were such as our interest or our honour commanded us to insist upon.* —But there are certain facts belonging to this subject, that may, perhaps, never have been clearly understood by the people in general; and, if understood at the time, may very well have been forgotten, in the course of seven years and a half of a war that has produced an event for every month, that has driven four sovereigns from their thrones and their dominions, that has reduced as many more to be mere vassals of France, and that has put nearly all the ports and all the shipping and all the seamen of the Continent of Europe into the hands of that enemy, from whom to retain Malta and deliver Holland, we renewed hostilities. In the course of such a war the people, who have had to labour for the means of carrying it on, may very well have forgotten all the circumstances

attending its commencement; and, therefore, I shall here, as briefly and as clearly as I can, state the facts, which first came into notice, relative to prisoners of war.

—The moment that NAPOLEON (who was, in May, 1803, when the war began, on our part, *FIRST CONSUL*) found, that some of the ships of France had been captured, and their crews made prisoners, by our cruizers, *without a declaration of war previously made*, he issued an order, which was rigorously enforced, for *detaining* in France all those subjects of the King, who, from whatever cause, or for whatever purpose, happened to be there at the time. The grounds alledged by France for doing this were; that England had acted contrary to the settled rules for the conduct of nations, in making such captures without a declaration of war; that, in seizing peaceable traders upon the *water*, on which she happened to possess the power of so doing, she justified the conduct of France in seizing British subjects equally peaceable, who happened to be upon the *land*, where France had the power of seizure; that justice *towards the captives* made by the English called for this measure, and that, the persons thus seized on in France (who were called the *Detained*) should be considered as prisoners of war, and should not be released, except in exchange for persons captured by the English. —Amongst the *Detained* were many noblemen; many women of noble families; many gentlemen of great estates; and, from the words of the above-mentioned Propositions, it appears, that there are still amongst the *Detained* an *Earl*, *Peers Sons*, *Privy Counsellors*, *Baronets*, *Knights*, *Gentlemen*, *Tradesmen*, and *Servants*. —But, at the out-set, our government *protested* against the proposal to make any exchange of French prisoners of war against these persons. We contended, that



a formal previous declaration of war was not necessary to make the captures complained of legal in the eye of the law of nations; that such previous declarations had been for a long time past, held to be unnecessary in order to constitute a state of war and to justify its usual operations; that the British subjects detained in France had been so detained in open contempt of the rights of all civilized nations; and that we would not, therefore, release them by an exchange for real prisoners of war, made by us from France or her allies.

—Now, however, it would seem, that this ground is given up, or, at least, that we have consented to exchange *real prisoners of war* for the *Detained*; though, at the time when the subject was first discussed (in 1803, Vol. IV of Register), every one seemed to be of opinion, that whatever prisoners of war we might make ought to be kept and applied *solely* to the purpose of obtaining the release of such of our own countrymen, who should be made prisoners of war *in actually serving against the enemy*, and that not a man of those, who, to use the words of the *Courier*, should have been captured “at the cost of the blood of our sailors and soldiers, and the treasure of the nation,” should be given up to purchase the freedom of those, who had been seized in the enjoyment of their pleasures in France, in the act of spending their incomes in France, and, indeed, in the act of showing that they preferred a residence in France to a residence in England.—Now, however, it appears to have been proposed to abandon this principle; and, not only to exchange real prisoners of war for the *Detained*, but to make *distinctions* as to the rank of the *Detained*; to consider them, in this case, not only as prisoners of war, but as prisoners of war some of whom have higher claims than the common soldier or sailor, taken in actual combat with the enemy; for we now see, that an *Earl* was to be taken in exchange for the French General Officer of *highest rank* now in England; that *Peers Sons* and *Privy Counsellors* were to be taken in exchange for French Colonels and Post Captains; that *Baronets* and *Knights* were to be taken in exchange for French Field Officers and Commanders; that *Gentlemen* were to be taken in exchange for French Captains of the army and Lieutenants of the Navy; and that *Tradesmen, Servants* and all others detained, were to be taken in exchange for *Private Soldiers and Sailors*.—As to the justice or

injustice of this part of the Propositions, that is a question which I shall, for the present, leave untouched; nor shall I offer any remarks as to the difference between this part of the Propositions and our protests and declarations of 1803; because, these are matters, which belong wholly to *ourselves*, and have no connection whatever with the points *lately* in dispute, and upon which points the negotiation for a general exchange appears to have been broken off. Neither will I, at present, go into any inquiry as to the proposal for giving up 3,000 French Prisoners of war, “made,” to use the words of the *Courier*, (see page 1050) “by British valour, and at the expence of *British blood and treasure*,” for 3,000 *Hanoverians*, who, it would appear from the Propositions, were included in the Capitulation made with the French in Hanover, and who are, or may have been, in *our service since that time*.—These are points for future discussion. At present I wish to see how the question stands between *England and France*; and, with this view, we must consider all the above descriptions of persons as being so many English prisoners of war in the hands of France, and that all were to be included in a Convention for a general exchange and release.—We must further remark, that, besides soldiers and sailors actually subjects of France, we have, in our prisons, captured in war, many soldiers and sailors belonging to the *Allies* of France; such as Dutch, Neapolitans, and others. These were, as appears from the Propositions, *all* to be exchanged against the subjects of England and her allies now held as prisoners of war in France and in the territories of her *allies*.—Now we come to the point in dispute, and upon which, it would seem, the negotiation was broken off.—Our Negotiator (see page 1045) proposed, that all the *BRITISH* prisoners in France and her dependencies should *FIRST* be exchanged against French prisoners in England and her dependencies; and that *AFTER THAT*, the French prisoners, who might still remain unexchanged in the hands of England, should be exchanged for an equal number of *SPANISH* prisoners.—There will be seen, in the Propositions, other minor stipulations, but what I have here stated is the main one; it is that upon which the whole of the dispute turned, and upon the disagreement as to which the negotiation broke off.—Let us now, then, hear



what is said on each side, and leave the decision to reason and justice and honour.

—The Emperor Napoleon rejects the proposition, because it *discriminates* between *British* prisoners of war and the prisoners of war made from the *allies* of *Britain*. He says (or, at least, the *Moniteur* says for him) what we have seen at page 1047; that the only way for us to have an exchange of prisoners, is, to consent to an exchange of French against *English, Portuguese and Spaniards, man for man, and rank for rank*; that, when a negotiation for *peace* is proposed, we say our *allies* the *Spaniards* must be admitted as a party, but that, when an exchange of prisoners is to be settled, we will not allow the *Spaniards* to be included, though taken in the ranks of our armies; that the *Spaniards*, who were taken in covering the retreat of General Moore, in covering the retreat of Lord Wellington's army at the passage of the Tagus, in enabling him to secure his retreat, in sallies with our troops at Cadiz, in covering our army during this campaign by suffering themselves to be shut up in the fortresses of Rodrigo and Almeida without receiving from us our promised relief, that all these people are now *disowned* by us; that an army is an army, and that since these people fought by our side, were armed with our arms, paid with our money, and clothed by us, they should be included in the exchange of prisoners, to whatever country they may belong.—In answer to this, the *COURIER*, ministerial news-paper, of the 24th instant (see page 1049,) says, that Buonaparté, in order to disguise the fact that he never entertained any serious intention of concluding a cartel, has had recourse to the most barefaced falsehoods. Not having leisure, apparently, to point out the particular proofs of these falsehoods, this writer proceeds to state, that our government was perfectly sincere in the desire of effecting an exchange of prisoners, which the correspondence, when laid before parliament, will prove; that we did offer to exchange *man for man and rank for rank*, including prisoners of the allied powers on both sides, and that this offer was **REFUSED**; that we have 50,000 French prisoners in the country [he includes those of the *allies* of France I suppose,] and that France has only 12,000 British; that we required that, in the *first instance*, the 12,000 *British* should be exchanged for 12,000 French, and that *after that*, we would give up the

remainder of the French prisoners for an equal number of Portuguese and *Spaniards*; that France would not consent to this, but insisted that for every 3 prisoners which we gave up, we should receive in return *one* British subject, and *two* subjects of our *allies*. After having answered Napoleon thus far, the ministerial writer proceeds thus: "We feel with regard to "our allies, the *utmost cordiality and esteem*, "and we highly approve of the offer of our "Government to apply to the relief of "their prisoners the surplus of French "that might remain in our hands *after* the "liberation of *all* the British should have "been effected; but we must say that this "country never could have tolerated so "monstrous and so mortifying an arrangement as that Frenchmen made prisoners "by British valour, and at the expence of "British blood and treasure, should be "set at liberty in exchange for FO- "REIGNERS, while our own Soldiers and "Sailors still lingered in captivity. After "this *plain unvarnished* statement, what "becomes of all those fine sentimental ex- "clamations of the *Moniteur*?—Had "the French government been actuated "by those feelings of humanity, which "are made such a parade of in the *Moni- teur*, 50,000 Frenchmen would ere this "have been restored to their country and "their homes."—Here, then, are the reasons on both sides. It is for the reader to judge who has the best of the argument; but, it is but fair to observe, on the side of the ministerial writer, that he has in reserve *certain proofs to be laid before parliament*; and, when these appear, we shall, doubtless, see good grounds for the offering to give up Frenchmen for 3,000 *Hanoverians*, at the very *outset* of the Exchange; and also good grounds for considering the *Detained* as entitled to be exchanged *before* our military allies of Spain and Portugal.—Certainly it is a very mortifying thing to reflect, that many even of our soldiers and sailors, taken in battle perhaps, and taken, too, from their being amongst the boldest men in the service, should remain wasting their time and their health in those very prisons, from which they would (upon the terms insisted on by France) see foreigners released by our government. Very mortifying indeed is this reflection; but, if Napoleon persist, to this mortification we must submit, or see no exchange at all take place. The number of our own countrymen who are prisoners, is, as the reader will perceive,



comparatively small. We have, it is said, 50,000 of the enemy's subjects prisoners, while he has only 12,000 of ours; but, alas! the wars in Spain and Portugal have put so many of our allies into his hands, that, if the exchange of the prisoners of the three nations were to go on in the way on which Napoleon insists, it is to be feared, that no inconsiderable part of our own countrymen, who are now prisoners of war, would still remain prisoners after the exchange, and, of course, would, unless supported by uncommon strength of mind, become a prey to despair. Had there been no wars in Spain and Portugal, this would not have been the case; we might then have had an exchange without any difficulty; or, at least, those obstacles that now exist, could not then have existed. But, it is too late to make these reflections. We have had, and we still have, those wars; and, if we, as some persons appear to be, are convinced, that those wars are fraught with so much glory and advantage, we must, on the other hand, submit with patience to some little inconveniences, flowing from the same source; and, it can hardly be supposed, that even the Gentlemen, who, at the feast at the London Tavern, so heartily cheered on to these wars, did not, in the progress of them, anticipate the possibility of some trifling obstruction to the general current of prosperity and joy.

SWEDEN.—The affair in this country seems now to be settled. From an Article, which will be found in a future Number, and from the Speech of the NEW CROWN PRINCE, it will appear, that the dynasty of Sweden has been changed with as little difficulty as a man changes his servants; and with much less difficulty than any man can change bad servants for good. Not only has there been none of that *opposition*, none of those *commotions*, which were so confidently foretold by our ministerial prints, and so strongly recommended by almost all our prints; but, the people, the whole nation indeed, but more especially the people, seem to have hailed him as the Saviour of their country.—And what are the remarks and reflections that this event; that the completion of this event, calls forth from our ministerial writers? You shall hear in the words of the Morning Post of the 29th of November:—"The *Moniteur* contains a long account of *Bernadotte's* presentation to the King

and Diet of Sweden. It would appear from his speech, that his Imperial Master and himself are two of the most pacific beings that ever drew breath. What a pity that men of such quiet dispositions should, by some unaccountable destiny, have shed as much human blood, and spread as much havoc and misery, among their fellow-creatures, as they could possibly have done, had they been born with that ferocious temperament which delights in conquest and revels in carnage. This harangue is matter of curiosity, chiefly as a specimen of the keen irony, the apparent *mockery of reason, truth, and justice*, which every modern French appeal to the sense and feeling of the people presents. We have already given an abstract of it. To complete the HUMBUG of the business, the new Crown Prince was entertained at Stockholm, in the evening of the 3d November with the Opera of *Gustavus Vasa*."—Suppose it true, that the *mockery of reason, truth, and justice* is glaring enough in all conscience in this harangue; but, this is not the only occasion upon which we have heard of this species of mockery. There is not, to people of sense and spirit, any thing more provoking, than to be compelled to witness such mockery. One would endure whole years of the greatest pain, for the sake of seeing the practisers of such insulting mockery receive their due. To stand by and see such barefaced mockery is almost beyond mortal endurance. Nothing much short of seeing the worms crawling into and out of the eye-sockets and the jaws of the insolent miscreants who practise such mockery ought to satisfy the public vengeance. But, is this the first time that the Morning Post writer ever heard of such mockery? Oh no! he has heard of "*mockery*" and "*humbug*," far greater than this. This *mockery* and *humbug* is a trifle light as air to the *mockery* and *humbug*, which he has heard of before, and of which he has given an account; of which he has been the recorder.—But, *humbug* as this may be, it is not to be laughed at by us. To us, it is no joke. To us it is a subject for any thing rather than mirth. For, now we see Sweden in the hands of Napoleon; completely in his hands, with all its powers capable of being brought into play against this island, under the direction of one of the ablest even of those whom Napoleon has selected as the most able.—The order issued for the raising





of sailors at Bremen for the Imperial Navy is, perhaps, as good a proof as we could have of his intentions against us:—  
 “Bremen, Oct. 30.—His Imperial Majesty the Emperor of France having demanded of the city of Bremen a certain number of able seamen to serve on board the Imperial fleet, our Senate has called upon all seafaring men resident in this city and the districts thereof, who are yet able and fit for the sea service, to avail themselves of the signal advantages which are offered by the agents of the Imperial French navy, and enter on board the French fleet.”—He will thus compel the several maritime towns to raise seamen, who, if they will not enter, will be impressed, and it will be quite good to hear the sentimental strains of the Morning Post and his brethren upon the latter subject especially.  
 —What is to hinder the Emperor Napoleon, then, from fitting out as many ships as he may think necessary? It is emptiness hardly to be conceived to suppose, that he will not do it if he can; and that he can do it is certain. And, what, then, I should be glad to know, will the consequence be, if we should, by any unforeseen accident, be worsted in the South of Europe after having exhausted ourselves by the wars there? If that should be the case, it will be then that the war will begin, that the real war against England will have a beginning.—I do not say that this is likely; I cannot say so, after the Despatches of Lord Viscount Talavera; but, it is, perhaps, possible, and I am, I must confess, not very easy under the belief of such possibility.—And yet, this writer looks upon the complete surrender of Sweden to France as a humbug; as a mere mockery; as a thing to call forth a little contempt; and nothing more!—In the mean while, the same writer recommends, in the most forcible terms, an acknowledgment of the King of Sweden, who is now, it seems, at Hampton Court; and also a congratulatory address to him from both Houses of parliament! Was I wrong, then, reader, in saying that this writer was mad?

PORTUGAL. THE WAR.—Great indeed must be the mortification of my readers not to find that Massena and his army are taken. There is now said to be intelligence to the 15th of November, and that it left the starving French army, not only alive, but occupying their old posi-

tion. Meat and bread and all other human eatables they had none of long and long enough before. What, then, have they lived upon? They must surely have COUNT RUMFORD in their camp! But, if every man of them had a “digester,” nay, if each man’s stomach was a digester equal in power to that of the Count’s, what good would that do them, seeing that they can have not even bones, except those within their own skins, to digest? Their horses, as the reader well knows, they had stewed down for soup, long before the last Despatches came away, and to suppose that the bones did not follow the flesh and the soup would be to give the cooks credit for incredible abstinence. PETER PINDAR was afraid that the Count’s invention would lead to a general gaol-delivery, for that it would teach the felons to cook their fetters and the stones of their prison walls, and thus eat their way into liberty. Surely, the French must have carried their culinary discovery to some such pitch, or they must have perished with hunger before now? At any rate, it really does appear, that this army is still alive.—From its arrival at Torres Vedras it was in a trap; it has never had more than the bare ground on which it stood; its general was got into the mire; Lord Viscount Talavera laughed at him; he was laughed at by every body; and yet he and his army were not taken on the 15th instant; nay, we are told, that there are some doubts as to when he will be captured, and some (of the Oppositionists, to be sure,) go so far as to say, that he will not, in their opinions, have been captured by this time! After this, I should not wonder, for my part, if they were to say, that he would not be captured at all; for, if they will say this, what will they not say? If they can coolly doubt of a man’s being captured who is already in a trap, they will not believe in his capture, though they see him landed at Portsmouth.

—To reason with such persons would be folly; I shall, therefore leave them to be convinced, if that is possible, by the glorious event which all reasonable men and orthodox politicians anticipate with so much confidence.—In the meanwhile, however, I cannot help observing the altered tone of our friend of the Morning Post, who now insists upon it, that the sending of reinforcements to Lord Talavera is wise, and even necessary! I really must give way to my indignation at this. I try, but I cannot contain myself upon this point. What! Beat the French at Busaco and fire



the Park and Tower gais; we then draw them, drag them after us, as if by a rope round their neck, to Torres Vedras; we get them safely into a trap; then laugh at them, while they are starving there and stewing down their horses; and after all this, we want reinforcements from England in order to be able to attack them; attack, did I say? nay, by all that's impudent, in order to be able to withstand them! What! need reinforcements in order to be able to withstand an army, nay, a part of the army whom we had beaten so shamefully at Busaco? Need reinforcements in order to enable us to withstand an army that were without provisions or huts; whose rear was cut off; who had not an inch of ground but that on which they stood; an army that we had caught in a trap, and that we laughed at: stand in need of reinforcements from England to withstand such an army?—Ah! “fashionable world!” Ah! “the most “thinking people” in Europe! Pray do look well at all this. Do, if you mean not to be “laughed at” yourselves, guard your ears against the assertions of those truly abominable prints.—You will observe, that one of two things must be true, namely, that reinforcements cannot be necessary, nay that, as adding to the number of mouths at Lisbon and within the lines, they must be injurious to our army; or, that what the Morning Post has told us about traps and starving and laughing at is falsehood. Let the venal gentleman choose between these two. And, observe again, that, if he should say, that his intelligence about the traps, &c. was not of his own invention, he only shifts the falsehood from his own shoulders to those of his correspondents in Portugal. Here, therefore, let him choose again; but, let us be upon our guard. Let us wait the event, and believe not a word that he and his fellow-labourers say.

KING'S ILLNESS.—The reports, since my last, are as follows; signed by the same Doctors as before.

Windsor Castle, Nov. 26, Eight p. m.

His Majesty has continued nearly the same throughout the day.

Windsor Castle, Nov. 27.

His Majesty has had between two and three hours sleep in the night, and is this morning much the same as yesterday.

Windsor Castle, Nov. 27, Eight, p. m.

His Majesty has been rather better throughout this day.

Windsor Castle, Nov. 28.

His Majesty has had some sleep in the night, and upon the whole is much the same as he was yesterday.

Windsor Castle, Nov. 28, Nine, p. m.

His Majesty is not quite so well this evening as he was in the morning.

Windsor Castle, Nov. 29.

His Majesty has passed a quiet night, and appeared rather better this morning.

Windsor Castle, Nov. 29, Eight, p. m.

His Majesty is not quite so well this evening as he was yesterday.

Windsor Castle, Nov. 30.

His Majesty continues much the same to day as he was yesterday.

On Wednesday the 28th and Thursday the 29th of November, there was held a Meeting of the Privy Council, to which were called all the members of that body, without distinction.—Before this Council was taken the evidence of the five Physicians and Doctors as to the state of the King. This evidence, in the form of a REPORT, was, as we shall see, presented to the two Houses of Parliament the next day.

PROCEEDINGS IN PARLIAMENT.—(Continued from page 955.)—*King's Illness.*

—On Thursday, the 29th of November, the two Houses met agreeably to the adjournment. But, before we enter upon this day's proceedings, it will be proper to insert the names of the MINORITY in the division, which took place, upon the question of adjournment on the last day, that is to say on the 15th of November. The reader will recollect (see page 951,) that there were 343 for the then proposed adjournment, and 58 against it. The names of these 58 were as follows, errors excepted, and if there should appear to be any omission, or any wrong insertion, I shall be particularly attentive in the correcting of it.

#### LIST OF THE MINORITY,

On the Chancellor of the Exchequer's Motion for adjourning for fourteen days, on Thursday, the 15th instant.

Abercromby, Hon. J.	Bligh, T.
Aubrey, Sir J. Bart.	Combe, H. C.
Bradshaw, C.	Cuthbert, J. R.
Brougham, H.	Creevey, T.
Baillie, P.	Chaloner, Robt.
Bennet, Captain	Dundas, L.
Biddulph, R.	Dudley, North
Burdett, Sir F. (Teller)	Eden, G.
Byng, George	Elliot, W.



Fitzgerald, Lord H.  
Folkestone, Lord  
Greenhill, Robert  
Hanbury, Tracey  
Hurst, R.  
Hamilton, Ld. (Teller)  
Halsey, J.  
Horner, Francis  
Hutchinson, C.  
Hughes, H. L.  
Kensington, Lord  
Lambton, R. J.  
Lloyd, J. M.  
Mostyn, Sir T.  
Milner, Sir W.  
Markham, John  
Matthew, M.  
Maxwell, W.  
Madocks, W.  
Miller, Sir T. Bart.

Martin, H.  
Ossulston, Lord  
Osborne, Lord F.  
Pelham, C. A.  
Parnell, H.  
Romilly, Sir S.  
Somerville, Sir M.  
Spiers, —  
Sharp, R.  
Smith, Wm.  
Scudamore, R. P.  
Symons, Col.  
Tierney, Rt. H. G.  
Wharton, J.  
Williams, O.  
Wynn, Sir W. W.  
Wynn, C. W.  
Whitbread, Samuel  
Wardle, G. W.  
Walpole, General

The Proceedings of the 29th were begun, in the HOUSE OF LORDS, by the laying of the REPORT upon the Table, which was done by EARL CAMDEN, the President of the Council. The Report, at full length, will be found at the close of this Summary; and, it should be carefully read, and well considered by every man in the kingdom.—The report having been thus laid before the House, the EARL of LIVERPOOL rose to propose another adjournment to the 13th of December instant. He stated, the confident expectations of the Physicians of the King's recovery without reference to time, and the actual amendment of his indisposition, and the weight of the precedents of 1788; and he added, that the House had now, what they could not have in 1788, *experience of the King's recovery from former attacks*. He acknowledged the inconveniences attending the suspension of the Royal authority, but urged that, on the other side, there were inconveniences attending the introduction of a new authority to supply its place for a temporary purpose. The only way, therefore, of avoiding the difficulty, was for the Houses to *adjourn* again. He further said, that, if, at the expiration of another fortnight, there should appear *no prospect* of the King's speedy recovery, he should then deem it his duty to propose the appointment of a Committee of the House, for the purpose of examining the Physicians, agreeably to the form adopted in 1788. He concluded by moving the adjournment to the 13th instant.—EARL SPENCER opposed the motion. He said that the Houses were not assembled as a parliament, but merely as estates of the realm; that they ought to remain so not

a moment longer than inevitable necessity required; that there was no proof of any such necessity; that, therefore, besides the reasons suggested by the perilous state of the country, the spirit of the constitution called upon them to take *immediate* steps for being prepared for supplying the place of the Royal Authority which was now suspended. He therefore moved, as an amendment, to leave out all the words of the Earl of Liverpool's motion but the word "*That*," and to insert "a Select Committee be appointed to examine the Physicians, in attendance on his Majesty, relative to the state of his Majesty, and to report the examinations to the House."—EARL MOIRA, upon the question being about to be put, rose, and expressed his surprise that none of the ministers attempted to answer the objections of Earl Spencer. He then proceeded to say, that, instead of *three* facts, which the Earl of Liverpool had said the Physicians proved, namely, the *existing malady*, the *expectations of recovery*, and the *actual amendment*, they proved but *one*, namely, the melancholy fact of *existing malady and incapacity*; all the rest was *speculation*, and the House had *already seen* what confidence was to be placed in this species of speculation. The Noble Lord had talked, he said, of introducing a new authority, but what new authority was to be introduced? would not the object of their proceedings be to continue the functions of the Monarchy, of which the personal exercise by the Monarch was now unhappily suspended? He said, surely the King upon his recovery would be gratified to find that these measures had been adopted which were best calculated for the support of the Monarchy and the security of his Majesty and his family; that their Lordships had a great public duty to perform, and they could not justify themselves to their fellow-citizens if they now delayed proceeding to the performance of it; that they surely would not hold out to the people, that the personal exercise of the Royal Authority was of so little consequence that it might continue suspended from fortnight to fortnight, leaving the authority of the Crown in the hands of the Committee who were now exercising it, neither was it fitting that they should leave authority in the hands of a government who had not the confidence of the people, and who were believed by that people to be incompetent to the duties of their station. He was, therefore, for taking those prelimi-



nary steps which were necessary for the ground-work of their future proceedings, and, of course, was for the amendment moved by Earl Spencer.—The EARL OF HARROWBY took the same ground as the Earl of Liverpool. He repeated the inconveniences that would arise from the measures to supply the place of the King, and also urged the *experience* they had had of the *former recoveries of the King*. He also said, that the House ought to consider *what King it was that would be set aside by measures of supplying his place; that it was this King of England, whose benignant reign it had pleased Providence to extend* ..... Being called to *order* here, he repeated, that the appointment of a Regency, would, for the time, *set aside* the King. The objection to this language was repeated, and his Lordship soon afterwards sat down.—THE MARQUIS OF ABERCORN justified the language of Lord Harrowby; and said that it was necessary to introduce the name of the King, when his Majesty was the subject of debate.—LORD HOLLAND, after stating, in a very clear manner, the situation of the question before the House, proceeded thus:—"The Noble Secretary of State has talked of *inconvenience, of partial and comparative inconvenience*. Was it possible to compare the inconveniences, to use the Noble Lord's language, of the year 1788, to the dangers, the awful and unparalleled dangers of the present period? It was not to be forgotten that those who now constituted the Government of the Country, and who, he might venture to say, did not command the confidence of the nation, were now exercising an additional and supreme authority, and that they were extending their power almost beyond the verge of responsibility. He felt deeply the state of the empire, and was willing to adopt the metaphor of the Noble Earl (Harrowby). That Noble Lord had recommended delay, he could discover no danger in a still longer suspension of the Executive functions. The vessel of the State, the Noble Earl thought, was under an impulse which would not be likely to cease, and would probably enable it to escape the shoals if left unaltered. The *impulsus remorum* was in his mind still vigorous, still effective. Now he (Lord Holland) feared that we were not on so calm a sea as the Noble Earl appeared to apprehend, he saw the vessel of the State assailed by tempests, and

"nobody at the helm; he saw her driven in a storm that threatened awful and approaching danger. The Noble Lord informs us, that we ought not hastily to *transfer authority*, but he denied that any authority existed to be transferred, the Royal authority was suspended, and unless supplied or vested in another person, there could be no Executive Power in the country. He conjured the House, therefore, to reflect before they suffered it to go abroad, before they permitted it to be said, that at a moment so critical as the present, when, among many embarrassing circumstances, the absence of so large a part of our military force, was one not the least deserving of attention, or the least productive of the most justifiable apprehension, the House of Lords was content to confide the Supreme Power and Authority of the Realm to the hands of Ministers, and had adjourned for a second fortnight without the adoption of a single measure that could tend to the security or the benefit of the country. The noble Earl had talked of other facts, and remarked that we had now had experience of the nature of his Majesty's malady, and of the probability of his recovery. Whatever that experience might be, the Noble Earl seemed to forget that it was impossible it could have any weight or influence in their present deliberations. Neither of these facts were before them in an authentic shape; the report of the examinations taken before the Privy Council, was not ground on which they could institute any proceedings whatsoever. Before they could perform any legitimate act, they must ascertain in a regular form the fact of the Royal incapacity. But by the system into which it was now proposed to enter, this evidence would never be attained; for there was nothing in the reasons adduced to justify the proposed adjournment, that might not, should his Majesty's illness suffer no abatement, be applied with equal force and justice to future and indefinite adjournments. Thus the period, when it will be acknowledged on all sides that the defect of the Executive Authority ought to be supplied, is placed at a remote distance, and all the evils of such a state of things aggravated by being rendered in a manner permanent. He called on Ministers, and requested not to be considered in the light of their



"opponent, while he cautioned them to  
 "pause on the verge of their strange  
 "and unaccountable proceeding. A Bill  
 "of Indemnity might hereafter screen  
 "them from the personal consequences of  
 "their rashness, but nothing could rescue  
 "the country from the hazard of those  
 "perils which were collected and darkened  
 "round her." — The EARL OF WEST-  
 MORELAND was for the original motion,  
 and LORD DARNLEY against it. — LORD  
 GRENVILLE, in a speech which I have not  
 room to insert and not time to analyse,  
 went into the whole of the subject, in a  
 very able manner, which the reader will  
 easily conceive from the following brief  
 sketch of its conclusion:—"He then ad-  
 "verted to an observation, which had  
 "fallen from a noble Earl, relative to set-  
 "ting aside the King. In all the debates  
 "of 1788, it was never said, that by the  
 "establishment of a Regency the Monar-  
 "chy was set aside. There was no ques-  
 "tion about the vacancy of the throne, or  
 "upon whom the crown should devolve;  
 "but who was to exercise the executive  
 "power, in trust for the sovereign, and in  
 "his name. He felt it incumbent on him  
 "to notice such expressions, because it  
 "was improper they should go forth to  
 "the public unreprieved. They were cal-  
 "culated to excite a compassion that was  
 "not called for, and to give invidious repre-  
 "sentations of the conduct of others, and  
 "ultimately to shake the confidence of  
 "the people in the monarchy. There  
 "was no question of setting aside the  
 "King. A noble Earl had said, that the  
 "suspension of the King's authority did  
 "not necessarily produce a suspension of  
 "the Executive Government, but that it  
 "might be carried on by the existing authori-  
 "ties. He would wish to have that ques-  
 "tion determined. He would not go to  
 "extreme cases of a day or a fraction  
 "thereof, but he would maintain that the  
 "Government could not be carried on if  
 "the Royal Authority were suspended for  
 "any time. For this he had the autho-  
 "rity of the venerable person who at that  
 "time filled the office of President of the  
 "Council. That noble person declared it  
 "in his place in these words, '*this calamity*  
 "*has produced a complete suspension of all*  
 "*the functions of the Executive Government.*'  
 "If Ministers would look into the Foreign  
 "Office, they would there find upon  
 "record an avowal to the same effect  
 "from the Marquis of Carmarthen, then  
 "one of the Cabinet. They would find

"it in these words, in an answer to a dis-  
 "patch from one of our Ministers at a  
 "Foreign court: '*I have received your im-  
 "portant letter, but can give you no instruc-  
 "tions on account of his Majesty's unfor-  
 "tunate indisposition.*' Did Ministers mean  
 "to say that they might receive his Ma-  
 "jesty's commands, though parliament  
 "could not? Talk of new Governments in-  
 "deed, was there ever so monstrous an as-  
 "sumption of power as this? What, are  
 "they, uncontrolled by Parliament, to  
 "issue their orders to Admirals and Gene-  
 "rals: nay more, that they shall exclu-  
 "sively have the care of the King's person?  
 "He never heard of such a power in the  
 "Constitution, as that the great officers of  
 "State might act independent of the crown.  
 "A Noble Earl had talked of leaving the  
 "vessel of the state to be borne along for  
 "some time *impulsu remorum*. Never  
 "was there a more unfortunate application  
 "of a figure. What, when the helm was  
 "abandoned, the sails torn, the masts  
 "gone by the board, and the vessel in  
 "danger of going down, was she in such  
 "circumstances to be left to the impulse  
 "she had previously received; was no ef-  
 "fort to be made to save her, to bring her  
 "into port? Was she to be left, thus la-  
 "bouring, to what the Noble Earl call-  
 "ed *impulsu remorum*?" — The LORD  
 CHANCELLOR (T. ERSKINE) said, "The con-  
 "stitution, acting upon that wise maxim  
 "of law, that as the monarchy was heri-  
 "ditary, the King was King in all in-  
 "stances, either in infancy or in nonage,  
 "in health or in sickness, in decrepitude  
 "or dotage. It was upon the political  
 "capacity of the crown being entire, that  
 "the constitution wisely abstained from  
 "any antecedent provision to meet such  
 "deficiency, but knowing, though the  
 "theory was perfect, that man was not so,  
 "but subject to various infirmities, our  
 "ancestors left it to the wisdom of pos-  
 "terity to provide for the evil, when the  
 "evil occurred. The sole consideration  
 "now was, whether the House, with such  
 "information as the Privy Council took  
 "leave to submit to their Lordships,  
 "should pause, or whether it should at  
 "once go into that important work in  
 "which they may be hereafter engaged.  
 "For himself he would state his opinion,  
 "that he would do nothing but what the  
 "evil of the day required. Their Lordships  
 "had certainly the right of interposition,  
 "but it was to be recollected that it was  
 "the necessity gave them that right,



“and that the proper correct time of interposing, was of the essence of that necessity. The Noble Lord felt that he would well deserve, as he would receive, the reprobation of his Sovereign, in case of his restoration, if through personal regards for him he abandoned the interests of the country. Believing both identified on the present question, he concluded with conjuring the House as it valued the feelings of the Sovereign and the interests of the country to accede to the adjournment.”—LORD ERSKINE said that the Noble and Learned Lord had alluded to the differences that took place in the opinions of the great men of that time, and certainly there never was any period of our history more distinguished by men of high talents—but though honest men might differ on the means of applying abstract questions, yet upon the whole, their differences were immaterial, and were more as to forms than as to principles. On the great maxim of the Constitution, that the Kingly office never dies, they were agreed. The pains of death the King must suffer like every other human being, but the office was immortal. And of this office there was no suspension: there could be no suspension, for all the faculties of the Government emanated from it and depended upon it. In case of natural demise, the next heir instantly supplied the place; and, in a case like the present, the States of the Realm had to find the fact by which alone their jurisdiction took place. In the year 1788, their jurisdiction was delayed, because a difference of opinion arose as to the mode of proceeding; but nothing of the kind took place now. They were not interrupted. There was no variance; and the only business they had to do was to establish the fact that was to give them jurisdiction. In the former instance they adjourned for four days, to obtain the information upon which they were to proceed.—Now it was proposed to adjourn for fourteen days for nothing. Till they had by their own examination found the King's personal incapacity, they had no power whatever to act. He would abstain from all allusion to what they would think fit to do when their jurisdiction should commence—but he could not agree that the functions of the Executive should be suspended for seven weeks, which would actually happen, if the motion of ad-

“journment should be agreed to. He denied the right of the two Houses to keep the country without a Government for that time. A Noble Earl talked of setting the King aside. It was Ministers who set the King aside; and they did it against all the analogies of the Constitution; for nothing could be more outrageous than to take up the *ipse dixit* of the Privy Council, and to usurp the power of adjourning themselves from time to time. He said they had no power to adjourn themselves for one day. He had thought so in the first instance, and he had not voted for the adjournment to this day.—EARL STANHOPE said, The two Houses were in the present predicament declared by the Bill of Rights to be the full and free Representatives of all the States of the Realm. And in that capacity alone could they act; nor could they do one act in that capacity more than the necessity of the case required. A Parliament acted by the authority of the King. A Convention acted by the authority of necessity, and the necessity must be proved. They could not act without first ascertaining the fact. They were like Judge and Jury in a Court of Law. They could not decide without having the evidence upon the case before them. They could take no hearsay evidence, no *ipse dixit* from the Noble and Learned Lord, no, nor from the Privy Council, who had not themselves any right to take such examination. They knew nothing in that House of the King's incapacity but from the assertion of the Learned Lord, and from the Report of this Privy Council. By what Law did this Privy Council take upon themselves to declare the King's incapacity? Not by the Common Law, and he was sure he had read more law books than the Lord Chancellor, and therefore he would take upon himself to say that it was not by any statute that they had derived such a right.—The Learned Lord had ingeniously contrived to drive their Lordships aside from the question, to which he had not spoken one word. He had chosen to talk about a Regent. Had any one else spoken a word about a Regent that day? That was not the business now before them. These blessed Ministers of the King were anxious only to possess themselves of the whole power of the realm, and that at a time the most tremendous. The Noble Earl concluded with exhibit-



“ing a most striking picture of the present  
 “state of Europe, and of the dangers and  
 “confusion with which we are now threat-  
 “ened at home.—THE MARQUIS OF  
 “LANSDOWN, in an elegant speech, ani-  
 “madverted on the argument of the Lord  
 “Chancellor, and said it was proposed to  
 “make them commit the crime of aban-  
 “doning the country, while the Executive  
 “Government was totally suspended.—  
 “HIS ROYAL HIGHNESS THE DUKE OF  
 “SUSSEX felt it his duty to explain the  
 “motive of the vote which he should give  
 “that night. He had on a former day  
 “voted for the adjournment to this day,  
 “because this was the day to which his  
 “Majesty had himself designed to pro-  
 “ceed the Parliament. But now when  
 “it was further proposed to adjourn, he  
 “must declare that he should vote against  
 “it from considerations of attention to his  
 “Majesty. They would believe that he  
 “was most sensibly affected by the me-  
 “lancholy situation of the public affairs.  
 “And that he most fervently prayed for  
 “his Majesty’s speedy and perfect reco-  
 “very. But he could not vote for an ad-  
 “journment in circumstances so imminent,  
 “and particularly, because he desired to  
 “know WHO WAS TO HAVE THE  
 “CARE OF HIS MAJESTY’S PERSON?  
 “—The House then divided on the  
 “Amendment, Contents 56; Not-Con-  
 “tents 88.—They then divided on the  
 “main question, Contents 88; Not-Con-  
 “tents 56.—The House is therefore  
 “adjourned to the 13th December.”—

In the HOUSE OF COMMONS, The  
 CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr.  
 Perceval) made a similar motion to that  
 made by LORD LIVERPOOL, in the House  
 of Lords. After stating all the reasons,  
 whence he concluded, that there was a  
 fair prospect of the King’s *speedy recovery*;  
 and that, in the meanwhile the House had  
 a choice of evils before them, he went on  
 to observe upon the precedent of 1788,  
 and to state, that the prospect of recovery  
 was now more promising. He concluded  
 in the following manner:—“From an  
 “examination of that precedent, then, it  
 “would appear that it afforded no ground  
 “for the House in the present circum-  
 “stances to proceed immediately to an  
 “inquiry of its own. It was indeed in  
 “direct opposition to any such proceed-  
 “ing immediately; for though an in-  
 “quiry by a Committee had been insti-  
 “tuted, though the suspension had ex-  
 “isted for three months, and though a

“Regency Bill had actually passed the  
 “House of Commons, yet when the Lord  
 “Chancellor, without any such authorita-  
 “tive document as that now on the table,  
 “stated on the 19th of February that an  
 “improvement had taken place in his  
 “Majesty’s health, an adjournment was  
 “agreed to for five or six days; then a  
 “second adjournment was carried, and so  
 “the proceeding was suspended by suc-  
 “cessive adjournments up to the 9th of  
 “the succeeding month. He did not  
 “mean to say, (he wished to God he  
 “could) that the amendment which had  
 “taken place in this instance was equal  
 “to that which had been stated by Lord  
 “Thurlow in 1789: but what he had  
 “said sufficiently proved that they could  
 “not be justly charged with having vio-  
 “lated the principle of that precedent.  
 “When an adjournment then had been  
 “agreed to upon a mere informal state-  
 “ment, after a suspension of the Royal  
 “functions for three or four months, it was  
 “in vain to say that the House was bound  
 “by that precedent or by the constitu-  
 “tion to adopt any particular proceeding  
 “on this occasion. It was left complete-  
 “ly at liberty to act according to its dis-  
 “cretion, with a view to the interests of  
 “the public and the benefit of the sove-  
 “reign. In the exercise then of the little  
 “discretion that belonged to himself, he  
 “concluded by moving, That the House do  
 “at its rising adjourn for fourteen days.”

—MR. WHITBREAD, after commenting  
 upon the statement of MR. PERCEVAL as to  
 the prospect of recovery, proceeded to  
 point out some of the many inconve-  
 niences that must arise from the suspen-  
 sion of the Royal Authority. He said,  
 “As to personal delicacy, that was a point  
 “very much misunderstood. His Ma-  
 “jesty himself, he had no doubt, would  
 “be the first to scorn and reprobate any  
 “personal delicacy, if shewn to him at  
 “the expence of bringing the kingly office  
 “which he had held with so much satis-  
 “faction to his subjects, into disrepute  
 “and contempt. What was the meaning  
 “of the words of Lord Camden, that the  
 “whole functions of the executive Go-  
 “vernment were suspended? What could  
 “be done in the actual situation of affairs?  
 “What sentence could be executed? Was  
 “there now any fountain of mercy?  
 “Could a criminal be pardoned? Could  
 “a general be appointed? Could assist-  
 “ance be sent to Lord Wellington if that  
 “should be requisite? Who was to per-



"form these functions? Could they (the  
 "ministers) do all this? they who pos-  
 "sessed a power to which they had no  
 "more right than any other individuals?  
 "If they could, *then they were Regents.*  
 "You, said Mr. Whitbread, talk of de-  
 "throning the King, a most improper  
 "and absurd expression; but you, your-  
 "selves, do worse, for *you take the Crown*  
 "*from the Constitution.* Had the right  
 "honourable gentleman a greater right  
 "to call the Privy Council together than  
 "any other member of that body? The  
 "necessity justified that measure, but if  
 "the period of the existence of such a  
 "necessity was improperly prolonged,  
 "the justification was gone. Let the  
 "House consider the time at which the  
 "whole executive functions were sus-  
 "pended, a time when a week had to  
 "carry a load before borne by centuries!  
 "If a military commander abroad should  
 "be wanted—if it should be requisite to  
 "appoint one at home, how was the de-  
 "ficiency to be supplied? If they (the  
 "ministers) were to abuse the authority  
 "which they now assumed, so as to call  
 "for *the animadversion of the House, to*  
 "*whom could the Commons go with their ad-*  
 "*dress?* Did they (the ministers) propose  
 "any remedy for all this? No, the  
 "House was misled by false impressions  
 "as to the state of the King's health, and  
 "even since the examination of the phy-  
 "sicians, it appeared that his Majesty had  
 "had but an indifferent night. Yet ano-  
 "ther fortnight was to elapse before any  
 "steps were to be taken to find a substitute!  
 "In 1801 and 1805 he was more or less  
 "accessible, though during the latter  
 "period the defect in his Majesty's eye-  
 "sight ought to have directed the atten-  
 "tion of Ministers to the proper measures  
 "of preparation for a state of things like  
 "the present. Now, however, his Majesty  
 "was inaccessible, and it was only from  
 "other persons that Ministers had their  
 "information on the subject of the King's  
 "malady. Even though his Majesty  
 "should recover, it ought to be con-  
 "sidered that it was the recovery of a  
 "man in years; and of a man (speak-  
 "ing of him as a man; who must be  
 "more in the power of others than  
 "before. The defect in his Majesty's  
 "sight too has been stated by Ministers  
 "themselves as a reason for refusing access  
 "to him on many important occasions.  
 "Let the House only duly consider the  
 "present situation of affairs, and then

"let him who could do it, vote for the ad-  
 "journment."—MR. YORKE spoke next  
 after Mr. Whitbread, but the only thing  
 new, said by him, was upon the subject of  
 the *inconveniences of a Regency.* He said,  
 "he should state shortly what those in-  
 "conveniences might be. Could it be  
 "contended, if the existence of the ma-  
 "lady should be of short continuance,  
 "which there was every reason to hope,  
 "that great inconvenience must not arise  
 "from the very circumstance of substitut-  
 "ing for this short period another person in  
 "lieu of the reigning Monarch? Sup-  
 "pose that the person so substituted might  
 "*change the system of Government pursued*  
 "*by the reigning Monarch;*—for though he  
 "was satisfied that the person likely to be  
 "appointed Regent, in the event of such  
 "an office becoming ultimately neces-  
 "sary, *could hardly be supposed likely to*  
 "*do this, yet it was possible, and he was en-*  
 "*titled to put the case.* Suppose it possible  
 "that the Regent should be *so ill advised*  
 "as to *overset the system pursued by the*  
 "*reigning Sovereign,* would it not be an evil,  
 "that on his return to the discharge of his  
 "royal functions, the reigning Sovereign  
 "should find all his measures overturned,  
 "and a totally different plan, which he  
 "did not feel equally conducive to the  
 "interests of his country, or to his rela-  
 "tions with Foreign States, substituted in  
 "its place? Suppose, for instance, that a  
 "Regent were to be appointed on the  
 "present occasion in this country, and  
 "that he were to abandon the interests of  
 "Spain and Portugal, and to consign them  
 "to their fate, would it not be a great in-  
 "convenience on his Majesty's recovery;  
 "and on his coming to resume his autho-  
 "rity, that he should find those two coun-  
 "tries abandoned?"—MR. PONSONBY'S  
 speech offered, as far as the news-paper  
 report, goes nothing new; nor does it  
 appear that he met, in front, this argument  
 of MR. YORKE about the dangers to be  
 apprehended from a change of system;  
 though it was very material to meet it,  
 seeing that it is an argument that will ap-  
 ply with equal force at any other time,  
 and may be a ground for an adjournment  
 at the end of every fortnight for years to  
 come.—SIR FRANCIS BURDETT, after ob-  
 serving, that with all the respect that he felt  
 for the King, he must be permitted to treat  
 the subject with impartiality and freedom,  
 said, that "he could not consent that  
 "things should be left for a moment  
 "longer in that perilous state in which



"they had continued for the last month,  
 "and in which it was proposed that they  
 "should be suffered to remain for a fort-  
 "night longer. The only doubt which  
 "remained with him was, who ought to  
 "supply the deficiency which here oc-  
 "curred? In the year 1688, when  
 "James II. left the throne vacant, in con-  
 "sequence of his having violated the  
 "contract he had entered into with his  
 "subjects, the right devolved on the peo-  
 "ple. If that was the fact then, he was  
 "not prepared to agree that any House of  
 "Commons, far less a House of Commons  
 "constituted and called together as this  
 "was, should have the right of filling this  
 "vacancy. The Right Honourable Gen-  
 "tleman (Ponsonby) had shewn that the  
 "Privy Council was assuming a right to  
 "which it was not entitled, and that this  
 "examination, now laid on the table, was  
 "no ground for any Parliamentary pro-  
 "ceeding, far less for persevering in the  
 "system of anarchy to which we were at  
 "present reduced. The evidence, as it  
 "was called, was evidence of nothing.  
 "If such had been offered in a Court of  
 "Justice, it would not have been ad-  
 "mitted. We all knew that interroga-  
 "tories could be so put by interested  
 "persons as easily to produce favourable  
 "answers. The last person whose evi-  
 "dence should have any weight in a mat-  
 "ter, such as that now under considera-  
 "tion, was the Minister, who was inte-  
 "rested to deceive. Yet on such evi-  
 "dence, the House was called on to  
 "grant the Government of the Country  
 "to the Right Honourable Gentleman.  
 "If he were asked if he would agree to  
 "the adjournment, he should feel himself  
 "called on to say, that he could not  
 "agree that the Right Honourable Gen-  
 "tleman (Mr. Perceval) should have  
 "the Government of the Country. But,  
 "that the emergency ought to be pro-  
 "vided for at once. The Honourable  
 "Gentleman under him (Mr. Whitbread)  
 "had alluded to various periods in which  
 "Regencies had been appointed, and be-  
 "sides the calamity under which the  
 "country at present laboured, had al-  
 "luded to the practice of petitions not  
 "now reaching the ear of his Majesty  
 "but through his Secretary of State.  
 "The very idea of petitioning indeed  
 "had in consequence become a mere  
 "farce, so that when petitions were talked  
 "of, persons could hardly keep their  
 "faces. These were imperious and com-

"pelling reasons for resisting the ad-  
 "journment. It was certain things could  
 "not be allowed to remain in their pre-  
 "sent state.—The arguments adduced on  
 "the idea of delicacy were most absurd.  
 "Delicacy was very well at a tea table,  
 "but to talk of it in the affairs of a na-  
 "tion was contemptible, particularly if  
 "that nation was cruelly loaded, as this  
 "was. When, in such circumstances, he  
 "heard delicacy talked of, he always  
 "thought it meant roguery. Delicacy to  
 "the other sex was to be applauded; but  
 "the law got over that where the matter  
 "was of importance. In the delivery of  
 "the Queen so much more was the regard  
 "paid to the importance of the matter  
 "than to any nice sense of delicacy, that  
 "precautions were at that period resorted  
 "to as to her, which in the case of any  
 "other lady would be thought grossly in-  
 "delicate. He hoped a prudential re-  
 "gard to the feelings of the King would  
 "not prevent the House from recollecting  
 "that there was a Crown also; and when  
 "people talked of the King of England  
 "with reference to the Crown, let them  
 "recollect, that he was never young,  
 "never old, and his functions never inac-  
 "tive or suspended. As to the precedent  
 "of 1788, which had been referred to, in  
 "his opinion it should be looked at only  
 "to be avoided. The Right Honourable  
 "Gentlemen opposite, however, only re-  
 "ferred to it that they might pick out  
 "what suited themselves. There was  
 "nothing in their whole conduct that did  
 "not prove them actuated by the inte-  
 "rested motives attributed to them by  
 "the Right Honourable Gentleman who  
 "spoke last. Whoever the person ought  
 "to be to whom the Kingly functions  
 "should, in the interim, be confided, it  
 "was not for him (Sir F. B.) to dictate  
 "to the House or to the nation at  
 "large; but, of this there could be no  
 "doubt, they could not go on in that  
 "ruinous tract they were now in.—  
 He concluded with the words which I  
 have taken for my motto, and was follow-  
 ed by GENERAL MATHEWS, who strongly  
 protested against leaving the government  
 of the country in the hands of the present  
 ministers.—Mr. C. W. WYNN, Lord  
 MILTON, Mr. ADAM, and Sir T. TURTON,  
 spoke against the adjournment, and Mr.  
 BRAGGE for it, as did also Mr. WILBER-  
 FORCE and Mr. FULLER, who ended the  
 debate. A division then took place, when  
 there appeared for the Minister's motion



233 and against 129.—Mr. PONSONBY then moved for a Committee to examine the Physicians during the adjournment; for the motion 137; against it 230.—Thus ended this debate. How many more such debates and such decisions there will be, it would be extremely hard to guess.—Mr. YORKE's argument was the *clencher*, and nobody, that I can perceive, met it at all. The argument was, that there would be a risk of great *inconvenience* in adopting measures preparatory to a Regency, because, when the King got well, he might possibly find, that the Regent had *changed the whole system of government*. Such change would, of course, include a *change of the ministers*.—The force of this argument, great as it is, is by no means of so much importance as its *universal applicability*. It is calculated for *all times* and almost *all occasions*; or, it is worth nothing at all. If it be good to-day, it must be good on the 13th of December, because the Regent if *then* appointed may make just the same changes as he might make if appointed *now*. A fortnight can make no alteration in this respect; nor can a month or twelve months, or any other space of time. And, in short, if to this argument any weight be allowed, there is but one way of getting over it, namely, making it a positive condition with the Regent, that he shall make no change whatever in the *system*, and, of course, that he shall make no change in *those persons* by whom that system has been advised and carried on; for that this last is absolutely necessary to the support of the system, is, I am sure, what no man living, who knows any thing of the matter, will attempt to deny. Of the effects of this system, which the nation has tasted most abundantly, and yet these effects are but just beginning to have their full relish. They are a sort of fruit that take long ripening; they are something like the flower of the aloe, which takes about half a century to bring it to perfection. Now, however, they seem to be upon the point of attaining all their richness; and, I must confess, that any thing that would check the progress or raise a doubt as to whom the merits of the culture belonged, would be injurious to the cause of truth.

W. COBBETT.

State Prison, Newgate, Friday,

November 30, 1810.

## OFFICIAL PAPERS.

ENGLAND.—KING'S ILLNESS.—*Report of the Privy Council, of the Evidence of the Physicians, on the 28th and 29th of November, 1810, laid before the two Houses on the 29th.*

COUNCIL CHAMBER, WHITEHALL, NOV. 28, 1810.

DOCTOR HENRY REYNOLDS

CALLED IN AND SWORN, AND EXAMINED.

Q.—You are desired to acquaint this Board, whether the state of his Majesty's health is such as to render him incapable of coming in person to his Parliament, or of attending to any kind of public business?

A.—His Majesty is certainly incapable at present of attending his Parliament or transacting public business.

Q.—What are the hopes you entertain of his Majesty's recovery?

A.—I have very confident hopes of his Majesty's ultimate recovery.

Q.—Do you found the opinion, given in your answer to the previous question, upon the particular symptoms of his Majesty's disorder, or upon general experience in other cases of the same nature, or upon both?

A.—Upon both.

Q.—Whether, in that particular species of the disorder his Majesty has fallen into, it has been found from experience that the greater number of persons so affected have been cured?

A.—Undoubtedly.

Q.—Can you form any judgment, or probable conjecture, of the duration of his Majesty's illness?

A.—No; I cannot form any decisive opinion upon this subject; it varies in different persons, and the time has varied in his Majesty's former indispositions.

Q.—Whether, as far as experience enables you to judge of his Majesty's disorder, you think it more probable that his Majesty will or will not recover, so as to render him capable of attending to public business?

A.—I think it much more probable that his Majesty will recover. My expectations at present are very confident of his Majesty's recovery. I speak this however with reference to the uncertainty that always attends medical predictions. With this reference, I should say, from what I see in his Majesty, that I have no doubt of it.

Q.—What degree of experience have



you had, yourself, in this particular species of disorder?

A.—In above forty years practice as a Physician, I have seen many instances of it.

Q.—Whether any amendment has already taken place in the course of his Majesty's disorder, and whether the appearance of such amendment continues at present?

A.—His Majesty is certainly better; and I am not sure that he was not full as well, if not better, yesterday, and continues so this morning, than he has been since I had the honour to attend his Majesty in this illness.

SIR HENRY HALFORD, BART.

CALLED IN AND SWORN, AND EXAMINED.

Q.—You are desired to acquaint this Board whether the state of his Majesty's health is such as to render him incapable of coming in person to his Parliament, or of attending to any kind of public business?

A.—I think it is such as to prevent his coming to Parliament, or attending to public business.

Q.—What are the hopes you entertain of his Majesty's recovery?

A.—I think it is in the highest degree probable, that his Majesty will recover.

Q.—Do you found the opinion given in your answer to the previous question upon the particular symptoms of his Majesty's disorder, or upon general experience in other cases of the same nature, or upon both? A.—Upon both.

Q.—Whether in that particular species of the disorder his Majesty has fallen into, it has been found from experience that the greater number of persons so affected, have been cured?

A.—I believe so.

Q.—Can you form any judgment, or probable conjecture, of the duration of his Majesty's illness?

A.—I cannot form a satisfactory conjecture.

Q.—Whether, so far as experience enables you to judge of his Majesty's disorder, you think it more probable, that his Majesty will, or will not, recover, so as to render him capable of attending to public business?

A.—Much more probable that his Majesty will recover.

Q.—What degree of experience have you had yourself in this particular species of disorder?

A.—In the course of 19 years, a good number of cases must have fallen under my cognizance.

Q.—Whether any amendment has already taken place in the course of his Majesty's disorder, and whether the appearance of such amendment continues at present?

A.—A very considerable amendment has taken place in his Majesty's symptoms; in the course of the last 24 hours his Majesty's mental health has improved; but in the same space his Majesty has been more indisposed bodily; but I have just reason to believe that I shall find that indisposition much mitigated on my return this evening.

DOCTOR WILLIAM HEBERDEN,

CALLED IN AND SWORN, AND EXAMINED.

Q.—You are desired to acquaint this Board, whether the state of his Majesty's health is such as to render him incapable of coming in person to his Parliament or of attending to any kind of public business?

A.—I consider the state of his Majesty's health to be such as to render him incapable of coming in person to his Parliament, or attending to public business.

Q.—What are the hopes you entertain of his Majesty's recovery?

A.—The greatest expectation of his Majesty's recovery.

Q.—Do you found the opinion given in your answer to the previous question upon the particular symptoms of his Majesty's disorder, or upon general experience in other cases of the same nature, or upon both?

A.—I found my opinion upon the improvement that has already taken place in his indisposition and the present integrity of his faculties, and the analogy this disorder bears to his former illness.

Q.—Whether in that particular species of the disorder his Majesty has fallen into, it has been found, from experience, that the greater number of persons so affected have been cured?

A.—I firmly believe that it does appear that the greater number of persons have been cured; but my own experience has not been great in that disorder.

Q.—Can you form any judgment, or probable conjecture of the duration of his Majesty's illness?

A.—I can form no judgment of the precise duration. In general I should judge that the duration cannot be long.

Q.—Whether so far as experience en-



ables you to judge of his Majesty's disorder, you think it more probable that his Majesty will, or will not recover so as to render him capable of attending to public business?

A.—I feel in my own mind no doubt that his Majesty will recover, and be capable of attending to public business.

Q.—What degree of experience have you had yourself in this particular species of disorder?

A.—Very little experience.

Q.—Whether any amendment has already taken place in the course of his Majesty's disorder, and whether the appearance of such amendment continues at present?

A.—Considerable amendment has taken place in his Majesty's disorder, and the amendment still continues.

DOCTOR ROBERT DARLING WILLIS,

CALLED IN AND SWORN, AND EXAMINED.

Q.—You are desired to acquaint this Board, whether the state of his Majesty's health is such as to render him incapable of coming in person to his Parliament, or of attending to any kind of public business?

A.—His Majesty is incapable at present of coming to Parliament, or attending to any public business.

Q.—What are the hopes you entertain of his Majesty's recovery?

A.—I entertain very confident hopes of his Majesty's recovery.

Q.—Do you found the opinion given in your answer to the previous question upon the particular symptoms of his Majesty's disorder, or upon general experience in other cases of the same nature, or upon both?

A.—Upon both.

Q.—Whether in that particular species of the disorder his Majesty has fallen into, it has been found from experience, that the greater number of persons so affected have been cured?

A.—I believe the greater number are cured.

Q.—Can you form any judgment or probable conjecture of the duration of his Majesty's illness?

A.—I cannot.

Q.—Whether, so far as experience enables you to judge of his Majesty's disorder, you think it more probable that his Majesty will or will not recover, so as to

render him capable of attending to public business?

A.—I think it more probable that his Majesty will be capable of attending to public business.

Q.—What degree of experience have you had yourself in this particular species of disorder?

A.—From my earliest infancy I had opportunities of observing complaints of this nature, as long as I remained under my father's roof. During the last two and twenty years I have seen a great variety of cases of this nature in private practice.

Q.—Whether any amendment has already taken place in the course of his Majesty's disorder, and whether the appearance of such amendment continues at present?

A.—A very considerable amendment had taken place in his Majesty's disorder, which continued when I left Windsor this morning.

COUNCIL CHAMBER, WHITEHALL, NOV. 29, 1810,

DOCTOR MATTHEW BAILLIE,

CALLED IN, AND SWORN, AND EXAMINED.

Q.—You are desired to acquaint this Board, whether the state of his Majesty's health is such as to render him incapable of coming in person to his Parliament, or of attending to any kind of public business?

A.—I think his Majesty is at present incapable of coming to Parliament, or of attending to any public business.

Q.—What are the hopes you entertain of his Majesty's recovery?

A.—I think it highly probable that his Majesty will recover.

Q.—Do you found the opinion given in your answer to the previous question upon the particular symptoms of his Majesty's disorder, or upon general experience in other cases of the same nature, or upon both?

A.—I found the opinion which I delivered as an answer to the second question, upon the consideration of the symptoms of his Majesty, upon perceiving no failure in the faculties of his Majesty, upon the soundness of his Majesty's constitution, and upon the resemblance which his present illness has to what I have heard of his former illnesses of the same character.

(To be continued.)